

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify some of the terms used therein. Applicants believe this amendment to be clerical in nature and does not raise new matter.

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garback in view of Taylor and further in view of Scully. Applicants traverse the rejection.

The claimed embodiments of the invention relate to choosing data related to a business trip from a plurality of schedule data entries (also referred to as "schedule data"). In Fig.3(a), for example, it is determined that the "captive building" which exhibits the value "0" does not signify an outwork, but the "client" or the "different captive building" which exhibits the value "1" or "2" signifies an outwork, and judgment is made based on such determination (page 10, lines 17-21). Information on the classification 207 is stored after a value corresponding to the location 206 is converted using such a table as shown in Fig.3(a) (page 6, line 2 to page 7, line 3). That is, the claimed embodiments use two parameters shown in the table of Fig. 7, i.e., classification and status, for determining (or extracting) business trip entries from schedule data including both business trip and non-business trip entries (page 15, line 17 to page 16, line 6). The non-business trip entries include a meeting in a company building or premise, as denoted as "other than outwork" in Fig. 7. From extracted business trip entries, unadjusted travel expenses may be obtained, and business travel applicant or schedule user may be informed accordingly.

As shown in the table, whether or not a given event is categorized as a business trip is determined based on classification and status in schedule information DB which is shown in Fig. 2. The claimed embodiments disclose extracting unadjusted travel expense data from scheduled data and adjusted expense DB. Garback does not disclose or suggest extracting business trip entries from "schedule information," in the manner recited in the claims.

Garback relates to computer travel planning system and deals with primarily business-trip-related data. That is, Garback describes a portal system that employees of a

company can use for planning their business trips. The system allows an user/employee to input business trip locations and dates and then access various travel planning agents, such as airplane ticket booking, hotel room booking, and rent-a-car booking, to purchase tickets or make reservations. Garback additionally describes a DB associated with "total travel manager" that is used to manage user's business trip planning. Garback, however, does not show the business trip extraction feature described above.

Taylor does not remedy Garback's deficiency. Taylor describes a system that expenses vouchers for business trips. The contents of the charge field and the expense field are compared with corresponding reference data according to predefined verification criteria to determine whether or not the contents of the charge field and the expense field satisfy the verification criteria. Taylor does not show above business trip extraction feature above.

Scully does not remedy the deficiencies of Garback and Taylor. Scully describes an electronic calendar system for defining the selecting subset of calendar entries during a view select function. Therefore, claims 1-5 and 8-10 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

All pending claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garback in view of Taylor and further in view of Scully and yet further in view of Whitesage. Applicants traverse the rejection. Whitesage does not remedy the deficiencies of the above references. Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are allowable.

Appl. No. 09/508,870  
Amdt. dated December 13, 2004  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group

PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Y. Cho  
Reg. No. 44,612

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
SYC:asb  
60293930 v1